



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,173	06/12/2000	Antonio Guama	1195-003	5454

7590 11/23/2001

James V Costigan Esq  
Hedman Gibson & Costigan PC  
1185 Avenue of the Americas Suite 2003  
New York, NY 10036-2646

EXAMINER
----------

ROBINSON, BINTA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/593,173

Applicant(s)

GUARNA ET AL.

Examiner

Binta M. Robinson

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-9 and 18-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. PCT/EP9808582.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

Detailed Action

1. In light of applicant's amendment at paper no. 9, the 112, first rejections of claims 13 in part, 14 in part, and the 112, second rejections of claims 2 and 15 in part made at paper no. 7 are withdrawn.
2. When the compound claims are allowable, the new method of treating claims 18-23 will be joined and examined as long as they are of the same scope as the allowable subject matter. In re Ochai 37 USPQ 1127 Fed. Cir. 95. In Re Brower 37 USPQ 2d, 1663 Fed. Cir. 96.
3. The new claims of 24-26 will be restricted out into an unelected group X that reads on agricultural compositions, a method of inhibiting steroid 5 alpha-reductase enzymes in plants, and a process for plant growth regulation. This group is a separate invention from the elected subject matter because it pertains to plants.

**(old rejections)**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 in part is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for reasons of record at paper no.7. The phrase "one or more Ni in a ring" connotes that a ring can potentially contain 5 nitrogen atoms. Pentazolyl rings and pentazines do not exist and are not enabled by the specification.

*100ep*

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In *re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In terms of the breadth of the claims, R1, R2, R3, R4, and R6 encompasses a much wider Markush grouping of radicals than those radicals tested which consist of hydrogen. 2) the nature of the invention is that these compounds are inhibitors of steroid 5 alpha reductases. 5) the level of predictability in the art was low since only two compounds, compounds 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10-octahydro-(1H)-benzo[c]quinolin-3-one and 2, 3, 5, 6, 6a, 7, 8,9 -octahydro-(3H)-benzo[c]quinolin-3-one, were tested for their inhibitory activity on 5 alpha reductase enzyme, where the R1, R2, R3, R4, and R6 moieties are all hydrogen.

The compounds showed an inhibition of greater than 50 %. However, the level of predictability regarding inhibiting activity is low because only these two compounds were tested. No compounds containing 5 nitrogens in a ring, for example were tested, for their inhibition activity. 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor is poor, because the applicant only conducts tests for two compounds where R1, R2, R3, R4,

Art Unit: 1625

and R6 is equal to hydrogen. The applicant does not test the whole breadth of compounds encompassing all of the moieties that these particular radicals can be. 7) the applicant only provides working examples for two, compounds 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10-octahydro-(1H)-benzo[c]quinolinzi-3-one and 2, 3, 5, 6, 6a, 7, 8,9 -octahydro-(3H)-benzo[c]quinolizin-3-one.

In terms of the 8<sup>th</sup> Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by the inventor. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim(s) 1, 10-12 in part are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by CA reference 103:195974 et. al. (See Reference U ) for reasons of record at paper no. 7. ✓

**(new rejections)**

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 -2 and 11-12 in part are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. In claim 1, page 2, lines 6-7, and all other occurrences throughout claims 1-2, the phrase "saturated or aromatic heterocycle containing one or more N atoms" is indefinite. There is no upper limit on the amount of N atoms that the heterocycle can contain.

*100P*

B. Claims 11-12 in part are indefinite for being improper product use claims. ✓

Applicant is referred to Clinical Products v. Brenner -Commissioner of Patents) 149 USPQ 475 (District Court DC 66) Ex parte Dunki 153 USPQ 678 (Bd of Appeals 1967).

2. Claim 3 in part is objected to because it is based on a rejected claim.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binta M. Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5437. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on (703)308-4698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7922 for regular communications and (703)308-7922 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0193.

Application/Control Number: 09/593,173  
Art Unit: 1625

Page 6

Binta Robinson

November 15, 2001

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Alan L. Rotman".

**ALAN L. ROTMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**